r Pettie,

At the risk of sewing your [illegible] and, which is not my intention, I must report that, aside from a few able well-worked cracks, "under foot foul" is nothing. I doubt if the author has read the Report and it would seem he has had less connection with the 26 volumes that the curlie wafted over the eten. He has basic names wrong, [illegible] toned stuff off the air and reused it, together with what he read elsewhere. For Example, aside from the proper names of people, there is "Barkley" Street for where Oswald lived, Bockley. His use of elaborate footnotes at some points and the total absence of any at other places is indicative of unoriginal work. This would seem to be the difference betwe n sources, if they were printed, or could be the difference between printed sources and those he heard.

It is wrong in a number of instances, and about the kinds of things those really knowing the subject would not be wrong about (unless they just didn't care, and I have no acknowledgment that such a possibility).

As you may have realized, much of it is, shall I say, "familiar" to me, including a number of things that appear in the work of the others.

In order to reach this opinion, I did take the time to read more than half of it. That is more than what was required to convince me. I went further to be able to assure you. The book is not worth any more time.

If you ever find my copies, I'd like to have one just for completeness of my files.

I am sorry there has to be such sour side. That it is effective is not enough. It should be accurate. Too often it isn't.

H